

that often are the most productive. One of the finest commissions the Nation has had, the Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies, produced its report in a little more than 1 year on a small budget and had significant influence.

Let a commission look at where we are and where we should go. My instinct is that sensible limits can be established.

For example, what if any new gambling enterprise established after a specific date had to pay a tax of 5 percent on its gross revenue. Those who are already in the field who are not too greedy should support it because it prevents the saturation of the market. Financial wizard Bernard Baruch said of those who invest in the stock market, "The bears win and the bulls win, but the hogs lose." Gambling enterprises that are willing to limit their expansion are more likely to be long-term winners. And those who know the problems that gambling causes should support this idea because of the limitations.

Or suppose we were to move to some form of supplement to local and State revenue again. States, Indian tribes, and local governments that do not have any form of legalized gambling would be eligible for per capita revenue-sharing assistance. It would require creating a source of revenue for such funding, but would bring some relief to non-Federal governments who do not want gambling but are desperate for additional revenue. There is no way—let me underscore this—of reducing the gambling problem without facing the local revenue problem.

Congressman JIM MCCREY, a Republican from Louisiana, has proposed that lotteries—now exempt from Federal Trade Commission truth-in-advertising standards—should be covered. Why should the New York lottery be able to advertise: "We won't stop until everyone's a millionaire."

These are just three possible ideas. The commission could explore others. The commission can look at how we deal with gambling opportunities that will surface later this year on an experimental basis on cable television and the Internet. How significant could this become? None of us knows.

We do know that two-thirds of problem gamblers come from a home where at least one parent had a problem with alcoholism. Should we be dealing more seriously with alcoholism, in part to deal with the gambling phenomenon?

These and other questions could be studied by a commission.

What should not be ignored by Congress and the American people is that we have a problem on our hands. We need to find sensible and sensitive answers.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, do I have time reserved under a previous order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes.

### GAMBLING

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, as always, the Senator from Illinois raises for this Senate the right questions and in a very sensitive way. I have said previously on this floor in discussing some other items that one of the growth industries in America, regrettably now, is gambling. There is more spent, at least for the more recent year I have seen, there is more spent for gambling in America than is spent on America's national defense. In a recent year, it was \$400 billion-plus just on legal gambling. We spend less than \$300 billion on America's defense. I think all of the questions that relate to this issue of gambling need to be asked and need to be studied.

It was interesting to me one evening when I had the television set on, though I was not really watching it much—and on one of the local stations in the Washington, DC, area they were doing their live drawing for their lottery. They do that live with these little ping-pong balls with numbers on them. It was on the screen. I never participated in those things. This was on the screen, and then across the bottom of the screen scrolled an urgent news bulletin. It was not so urgent that they would take the lottery selection off, because they were doing that live, they did not want to interrupt that.

So they kept on picking the lottery balls out and announcing the numbers. The news scrolled across the bottom of the television screen that Gorbachev had just resigned in the Soviet Union. I was thinking to myself, this is incredibly bizarre. Here is something that will affect the lives of virtually everyone in the world. The leaders of one of the major powers in the world resigns, but instead of cutting in with a news report, they cannot interrupt the lottery, so they scroll it across the bottom of the screen.

That is what we have come to, with respect to this issue of gambling in America today.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President if my colleague will yield for an observation. I thank him. As usual, Senator DORGAN is right on target on this issue.

Today, I regret to say, we have topped \$500 billion now in total gross income. It is a fast-growing industry in the United States.

Mr. DORGAN. That is probably legal wagers. There is substantial illegal wagering in America.

Mr. SIMON. That does not count what happens illegally. The second thing, the Senator mentioned in passing—as you saw them take these balls for the lottery—that you do not spend any money on it. Most people of our income level do not. It is the poor that they try to appeal to. And it is very clear, both from studies and from the advertising, that this is an attempt to extract money from the poor. We ought

to be able to get revenue in a better way for our Government.

Mr. DORGAN. I do not come to the floor suggesting that gambling is always wrong or ought to be made illegal. I think it is very useful to study, and I think that the commission approach makes a lot of sense. We ought to be evaluating what does all of this mean for our country? Who is affected by it, and how? That is what I think the Senator from Illinois was saying. I think it is timely and important. I have indicated that to Congressman WOLF and others, as well.

Mr. SIMON. I thank my colleague.

### LINE-ITEM VETO: WHERE ARE THE HOUSE CONFEREES?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I came to the floor to visit about two other items. One is the line-item veto. As the Presiding Officer knows, we passed a line-item veto here in the Senate in March. I voted for it, as I have on a dozen or 2 dozen occasions previously, because I think we ought to have a line-item veto. I voted for the line-item veto when President Reagan and President Bush were Presidents because I, as a Democrat, think that Presidents, whether Republican or Democrat, ought to have a line-item veto.

The House passed a line-item veto bill on February 6 of this year, and the Senate passed a line-item veto bill in March of this year. Now, there has been no progress since then because there has been no conference between the House and Senate. Why has there not been a conference? Because the Speaker of the House, who always told us he wants a line-item veto, decided he is not going to appoint conferees. So there will be no line-item veto until the Speaker decides he wants to appoint some conferees, and there is a conference and agreement, and then it comes back to both the House and the Senate.

Now, some will probably say that this is because the new majority and the Speaker may want to put their own spending projects in these bills and not have a Democratic President veto them.

This is a newspaper published on Capitol Hill. It says, "Gingrich Gets \$200 Million in New Pork," describing what was written, apparently, in appropriations bills that will benefit the Speaker. He may not want the President to target that \$200 million that was written into a bill that the Pentagon does not ask to be spent. Maybe the President would use a line-item veto to say this is \$200 million that the taxpayers should not have to spend on things the Pentagon did not want.

I noticed this morning in the Washington Post, "Extra Pentagon Funds Benefits Senators' States." It describes in some detail the extra funds put in for projects that the Pentagon has not asked for. These are things that will be built that the Pentagon says we do not want built. But money is added to